REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action of January 13, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-36 remain pending. Allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,452,597, hereinafter Goldberg) in view of Yamagishi *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,178,338, hereinafter Yamagishi). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 25 and 26 all relate to, *inter alia*, determining a number of options from a given set of options to include in an options list, wherein the number of options is dependent upon a display size of the options in the user interface of the underlying application. As discussed in Applicant's previous response and contrary to the Office Action's assertions, neither Goldberg nor Yamagishi teach or suggest such a feature. In response to Applicant's arguments, the Office Action asserts, at page 5, that Goldberg teaches determining a number of menu options from a given set of information such as toolbars, menu options and user selectable on screen regions. The Office Action's assertion reflects a misunderstanding of the teachings of Goldberg. Goldberg merely discloses, at col. 4, lines 45-47, that the displayed information can include the aforementioned types of information. There is no teaching or suggestion of determining what information or how many of those types of information to display. In other words, simply stating that different types of information can be displayed does not constitute making a *determination* as to a number of menu options from a given set of options to include in an options list. As such, Goldberg does not teach or suggest determining a number of options from a given set of options to include in an options list.

In addition, the determined number of options in claims 1, 25 and 26 is dependent upon a display size of the options in the user interface of the underlying application. While Goldberg discloses how to fit information onto a display screen given a display screen's limitations, Goldberg fails to teach or suggest determining *a number* of options based on a display size. The Office Action contends, at page 5, that Goldberg discloses determining the number of control information

such as menu options based on the size of a display area. Applicant respectfully argues that there is no such disclosure. While Goldberg does disclose automatically adjusting data and control information, there is no disclosure relating to determining *a number* of control information, merely adjusting the *size* of control information (i.e., size adjuster). Col. 4, ll. 48-51. Thus, modifying the size of control information based on a display size does not equate to determining a number of options to include in an options list based on a display size.

The Office Action further asserts that Goldberg, at col. 8, lines 44-65, discloses the step of determining the number of options to be displayed on the display area. In particular, the Office Action directs Applicant's attention to the adjustment of font size and number of lines used to allow more information to be displayed within a particular display area. The Office Action equates the determination of the number of lines used to display the information with the determination of a number of options to be displayed in an option list. Again, this assertion is without merit. The determination of lines in Goldberg is directed to determining how to fit a particular piece of information into the given display area. *See, e.g.*, Abstract; Col. 2, ll. 1-9. Goldberg's entire invention is directed to making displayed information readable by modifying size and appearance of the information, not determining a number of information to display given display size limitations. Simply put, Goldberg does not teach or suggest determining an amount of information to display, but rather describes determining one or more characteristics (e.g., font size, number of lines) of the information to be displayed that will allow the information to be displayed in a readable manner. Even in the example given in Goldberg at col. 10, line 62-col. 11, line 50, there is no determination of what information to display. The only determinations made are for modifying a number of display lines, font size and truncation of words (i.e., modifying "Address" to "Addre"). Instead of modifying the font size, number of display lines or truncation words, claims 1, 25 and 26 recite determining a number of options from a given set of options to include in an option list, wherein the number of options corresponds to one or more characteristics of a display. Claims 1, 25 and 26 are thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-24 and 27-36 are dependent on claims 1, 25 and 26 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 25 and 26 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein. For example, claims 5-7 and 8-11 relate to removing or adding, respectively, at least one option from an option list to adapt to the size of the display. In particular,

the claims recite removing an option from the option list if the size of the display decreases and adding an option to the option list if the size of the display increases. Again, neither Goldberg nor Yamagishi teach or suggest such a feature. The Office Action alleges, at page 6, that increasing or decreasing the font size makes more or less number of options to be displayed on the display screen in order to adapt to the size of the display. Regardless of whether such an assertion is actually valid, Goldberg does not teach or suggest increasing or decreasing the font size to remove or add, respectively, options to an option list. In fact, the purpose of Goldberg's invention, as stated before, is to fit all of a given piece of information into the display screen. The Office Action further contends that "it would have been well known in the art that the step of removing or adding information be display on the display screen in the computer art." The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide proper support for such a contention.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: <u>March 28, 2006</u>   By: _____

Chunhsi Andy Mu, Registration No. 58,216
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001